

There are to-day, and always have been, two Socialisms. In spite of a multiplicity of apparent tendencies, fundamentally the Socialist movement has been divided into two groups—the opportunist and the revolutionary. The opportunist has been dominant, and it is this dominance that brought disaster. It was nationalistic, and refused to adopt aggressive tactics equally against militarism and against capitalism. Shall we emphasize this nationalistic feature by separating the Allied sheep from the Austro-German goats? Or shall we strike a blow for revolutionary Socialism by separating the sheep from the goats in the Socialist movement of *each particular nation*?

It may be denied that there is such a thing as revolutionary Socialism. That, of course, would be in the true romantic style of denying the facts of life. The revolutionary Socialist is inspired by the minority in France and Germany, and by the intrepid stand of the Italian Socialist Party against the war. And it is these comrades that we cleave to in our action against the war, and not to the Austro-German majority, or to the majority of France. If the *whole* Socialist movement had acquiesced in war, I might sympathize with the philosophy of despair that has La Monte in its clutches. But it simply rouses my impatience, particularly when he accuses us of refusing to recognize the facts of life. Is it then only the *dominant* facts of life that deserve recognition?

It would seem that if acquiescence in war was the cause of the Socialist *debacle*, the finest contribution the American Socialist could make to the reconstruction of Socialism would be refusing to acquiesce in the war and expressing the revolutionary, international principles which alone make Socialism vital and vitalizing. But La Monte comes to a different conclusion, because under the influence of the philosophy of despair he sees with the eyes of the nationalist and not with the eyes of the revolutionary Socialist. But fortunately movements are sufficiently romantic and sufficiently vulgar not to be seized by the philosophy of despair *en masse*.

If in despair we are to reject Socialism incontinently, then any other course of action than that suggested by La Monte would be

unthinkable. But that is not our purpose. Where others have failed, we shall make good. We shall not imitate their errors, thereby strengthening their reactionary influence. We shall not criticize their actions, and then pursue a similar course of action. There being essentially two tendencies, or groups, in the Socialist movement, the collapse of the International becomes an incident in our development and an indictment of the dominant group. Our task, accordingly, is not to reject Socialism, but to reconstruct it. And in this reconstruction the Socialist attitude on war becomes fundamental. Our refusal to acquiesce in war will contribute mightily toward this revolutionary reconstruction; a contrary course would be disgraceful to-day, and suicidal in the days of reconstruction to come.

La Monte, apparently, believes in good wars and bad wars—this war against Germany being a good one. I shall discuss this later on, at this point I shall discuss the general principles applicable to all wars waged under the conditions of Imperialistic Capitalism.

Wars to-day are waged exclusively for purposes of aggression. A particular nation, in this case Germany and Austria, may be the immediate aggressor; but as the immediate causation of a war flows out of a preceding series of diplomatic struggles expressing economic interests, all nations engaged are fundamentally the aggressors—except the small nations that are simply pawns on the international chess-board of Imperialism. President Wilson has very justly said that this iniquitous war arose out of the *status quo ante*. And that status was not determined by the autocracy of Germany, but by the clash of Imperialistic interests between the two groups, in Morocco, in Mesopotamia and in Persia. The war that might have been precipitated at Agadir would have been no different than this one precipitated at Serajevo. Whatever the apparent causes, the driving purposes are identical—Imperialistic aggrandizement.

Our opposition to war is not simply based upon the fact that war is aggressive. It is equally based upon the fact that war is waged by nations, and for national interests. The nation has been a factor making for progress in the onward